UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/440,442 | 11/15/1999 | ARI V. KRISH | M-8038US | 2954 |

33031 7590 01/16/2004

CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD.
BLDG. 4, SUITE 201
AUSTIN, TX 78759

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| NAJJAR, SALEH | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2157 | 11 |

DATE MAILED: 01/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/440,442 | KRISH, ARI V. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Saleh Najjar | 2157 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 October 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *6,7 and 10-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *6,7 and 10-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

**1.** This action is responsive to the amendment filed on October 17, 2003. Claims 5, 8-9 were canceled. Claims 6, 7, and 10-30 are pending. Claims 6, 7, and 10-30 represent a method, apparatus and program product directed toward optimizing and processing pages in multiple languages.

**2.** The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**3.** Claims 6, 7, 10-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeske, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,443 in view of Greer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,247,048 further in view of Tan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,314,469.

Jeske teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a combined Internet and data access system via a plurality of interconnected platforms (see abstract).

As to claim 6, Jeske teaches method for processing requests from a computer network, said method comprising:

accessing a computer network from a computer system, receiving a request from a requesting computer attached to the computer network decoding a data string included in the request; and matching the request to a template file (see col. 3-4, Jeske teaches that a URL is generated and transmitted by the browser which is evaluated by the server to process a responsive web page using a template file).

Jeske fails to teach the claimed limitation of determining a character set, the character set including the character set used by the requesting computer, storing a predefined character read by the requesting computer sending the predefined character from the requesting computer to the computer system through the computer network;.

Jeske does teach that the client's operating system is determined from the initial request (see col. 4).

However, Greer teaches a method and apparatus for transcoding character sets between Internet hosts and client devices over data networks (see abstract). Greer teaches the limitation of determining a character set the; character set including the character set used by the requesting computer, storing a predefined character read by the requesting computer; sending the predefined character from the requesting computer to the computer system through the computer network (see col. 6, Greer discloses that a character set used by the client is determined from the request of the client which specifies the character set that should be used when responding to the request).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jeske in view of Greer so that character set transformation is affected. One would be motivated to do so to allow universally located clients access to the hosted data in the network.

The combination of Jeske and Greer fail to teach the limitation wherein the determining the character set used by the requesting computer further comprises:

reading a table, the table including a plurality of character codes and corresponding language codes; matching the predefined character to one of the plurality of character codes, the matching determining one of the plurality of language codes.

However, Tan teaches a multi-language domain name service where the server determines the encoding type of the DNS request by considering a bit string in the request and matching it against a known bit strings for known domains of various encoding types (see abstract). Tan teaches determining the character set used by the requesting computer further comprises:

reading a table, the table including a plurality of character codes and corresponding language codes; matching the predefined character to one of the plurality of character codes, the matching determining one of the plurality of language codes (see figs. 4-5; col. 12-13, Tan discloses identifying an encoding type of a DNS request

by identifying the digital sequence of the domain request and matching the sequence against records in a mapping table having corresponding encoding type).

It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jeske in view of Tan so that a mapping table is used to identify the corresponding encoding type of known digital sequences or characters. One would be motivated to do so to speed the search for a matching linguistic encoding type.

As to claim 7, Jeske teaches the method of claim 6 further comprising:

invoking a application process in response to the matching (see col. 3-4, Jeske discloses that the appropriate application is chosen for the requesting browser based on the type of request).

Jeske does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of a department process. However, Jeske teaches that the appropriate application is chosen based on the browser request, for example an application for processing a bank statement may be invoked or a application for processing call record may also be invoked (see col. 3-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jeske by specifying department logic in place of the application process since the same functionality is achieved.

As to claim 10, Jeske teaches a method for processing requests from a computer network, said method comprising:

connecting a computer to the computer network; receiving a data stream from the computer network; identifying a template within the data stream; searching a registration table, the searching programmed to locate application logic corresponding to the template; writing a web page resulting from the template; sending the web page to the computer network (see col. 3-5, Jeske discloses that a browser request is received by a CGI process on the server and using a virtual application process 107, an HTML template is defined and populated with data to form a responsive web page).

Jeske does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of a department process. However, Jeske teaches that the appropriate application is chosen based on the browser request, for example an application for processing a bank statement may be invoked or a application for processing call record may also be invoked (see col. 3-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jeske by specifying department logic in place of the application process since the same functionality is achieved.

As to claim 12, Jeske teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising: opening a socket, the socket connecting the computer to the computer network, wherein the receiving and the sending is through the socket and closing the socket (see col. 3, lines 30-45).

As to claim 13, Jeske teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising: creating a processing thread to process the data stream (see col. 6-8).

As to claim 14, Jeske teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising: decoding the data stream, the decoding including decrypting the data stream (see col. 3-7).

As to claim 15, Jeske teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising:

decoding a uniform resource locator, the uniform resource locator included in the data stream and identifying a server in the computer network (see col. 3-7).

As to claim 17, Jeske teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising:

processing a header contained within the data stream, the processing including: evaluating a security token included in the header, the security token created during a prior session by a user, to determine whether the session is valid, and creating a new security token, the new security token used to validate subsequent sessions by the user. (see col. 4-5, Jeske discloses that a session identifier is read by the processing application for client validation or authorization and that a session key is created and transmitted to each browser upon each log on request).

As to claim 18, Jeske teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising:

invoking a application process, the application process programmed to respond to a request included in the data stream.

Jeske does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of a department process. However, Jeske teaches that the appropriate application is chosen based on the browser request, for example an application for processing a bank statement may be invoked or a application for processing call record may also be invoked (see col. 3-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jeske by specifying department logic in place of the application process since the same functionality is achieved.

As to claim 19, Jeske teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising: identifying a template within the data stream (see col. 3-5, Jeske discloses that a template file is identified an used to create a responsive web page).

As to claim 20, Jeske teaches the method of claim 19 further comprising:

searching a registration table, the searching programmed to locate application logic corresponding to the template; and writing a web page resulting from the parsing of the template (see col. 3-7).

Jeske does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of a department process. However, Jeske teaches that the appropriate application is chosen based on the browser request, for example an application for processing a bank statement may be invoked or a application for processing call record may also be invoked (see col. 3-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jeske by specifying department logic in place of the application process since the same functionality is achieved.

As to claim 21, Jeske teaches the method of claim 19 further comprising:

parsing the template into one or more operators, tags, and banners (see col. 3-7).

Claims 11, 16, and 22-28 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 6-7, 10, 12-15, 17-21 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

**4.** Applicant's arguments filed October 17, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant argues in substance that A); the Greer reference does not suggest looking up a definition table for determining the character set used by the client terminal; B) there is no real motivation to combine the references of Jeske and Greer; C) There is no teaching or suggestion that Jeske's template is received as part of

a data stream from a computer network and that the department process is not taught by Jeske.

In response to A); a new ground rejection is given in this office action that adds the Tan reference to provide the deficiencies of the references in regards to the definition table lookup and therefore the argument is moot in view of the new ground rejection.

In response to B); In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Jeske and Greer references deal with Internet access systems and specifically the background of Jeske discusses the problem of accessing information not resident at the HTTP server that receives the request from the client and addressing the problem of retrieving content that differs in format than that of the HTTP server content.

In response to C); Jeske discloses that the template file is received at the gateway 106, merged with the corresponding data and sent to the browser (see col. 4, lines 1-10).

**5.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (703) 308-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Ario Etienne*, can be reached on (703) 308-7562.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600. The central official fax number for the group is (703) 872-9306.

Saleh Najjar

Primary Examiner / Art Unit 2157